



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/678,010	10/03/2000	Martin James Lucas	NA11P157/00.091.01	4542

28875 7590 03/30/2004

SILICON VALLEY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 721120
SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120

EXAMINER

CHEN, SHIN HON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/678,010

Applicant(s)

LUCAS ET AL.

Examiner

Shin-Hon Chen

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on October 3, 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2131

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 have been examined.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because the drawings are informal and somewhat difficult to read. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-30 are objected to because of the following informalities: triggering a break in said virus operation “is” said measurement value in line 9 of claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 18, 19, 21, 22, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Nachenberg U.S. Pat. No. 5826013 (hereinafter Nachenberg).

Art Unit: 2131

6. As per claim 1, 11, and 21, Nachenberg discloses a method of detecting computer viruses within a computer file (Nachenberg: column 1 lines 14-16), said method comprising the steps of:

- a. Receiving a request to scan a computer file for computer viruses (Nachenberg: column 11 lines 10-28);
- b. Initiating a virus scanning operation upon said computer file (Nachenberg: column 3 lines 3-53; column 11 lines 10-22);
- c. Calculating during said virus scanning operation a measurement value indicative of an amount of data processing performed during said virus scanning operation (Nachenberg: column 2 lines 15-25);
- d. Comparing during said virus scanning said measurement value with a threshold value (Nachenberg: column 1 line 63 – column 2 line 50); and
- e. Triggering a break in said virus operation if said measurement value exceeds said threshold value (Nachenberg: column 1 line 63 – column 3 line 53).

7. As per claim 2, 12, and 22, Nachenberg discloses a method as claimed according to claims 1, 11, and 21 respectively. Nachenberg further discloses the method comprises the step of, upon occurrence of said break, determining using said measurement value whether or not said virus scanning operation should be terminated prior to completion (Nachenberg: column 3 lines 37-53).

8. As per claim 8, 18, and 28, Nachenberg discloses a method as claimed according to claims 1, 11, and 21 respectively. Nachenberg further discloses said virus scanning operation

Art Unit: 2131

applies a plurality of test to said computer file, each test having an complexity value indicative of an amount of data processing associated with that test and said measurement value is a sum of complexity values for tests applied during said virus scanning operation (Nachenberg: column 1 lines 63 – column 2 line 50; column 6 lines 32-40).

9. As per claim 9, 19, and 29, Nachenberg discloses a method as claimed according to claims 8, 18, and 28 respectively. Nachenberg further discloses said plurality of test applied are selected in dependence upon said computer file (Nachenberg: column 1 line 18 – column 2 line 50; column 6 lines 32-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3, 6, 7, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nachenberg in view of Banga et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6240447 (hereinafter Banga).

Art Unit: 2131

12. As per claim 3, 13, and 23, Nachenberg discloses a method according to claims 1, 12, and 22 respectively. Nachenberg does not explicitly disclose said measurement value yields a processed data size value for data processed during said virus scanning operation. However, Banga discloses that limitation (Banga: column 7 lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Banga within the system of Nachenberg because it increases the efficiency by skipping a certain percentage of data without processed.

13. As per claim 6, 16, and 26, Nachenberg discloses a method according to claims 2, 12, and 22 respectively. Nachenberg does not explicitly disclose said measurement value yields a processed data size value for data processed during said virus scanning operation and step of determining is responsive to both said processed data size value and a computer file size value for said computer file when determining whether or not said virus scanning operation should be terminated prior to completion. However, Banga discloses that limitation (Banga: column 7 lines 1-10). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 3.

14. As per claim 7, 17, and 27, the combination of Nachenberg-Banga discloses a method according to claims 6, 16, and 26 respectively. Banga further discloses said step of determining calculates a measurement ratio of said processed data size value to said computer file size value and compares this with a termination size threshold ratio such that said virus scanning is terminated if said measurement ratio exceeds said termination size threshold ratio (Banga: column 7 lines 1-10). Same rationale applies here as above in rejecting claim 3.

15. Claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nachenberg in view of Cozza U.S. Pat. No. 5649095 (hereinafter Cozza).

16. As per claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 24, and 25, Nachenberg discloses a method according to claim 1, 11, and 21 respectively. Nachenberg does not explicitly disclose said amount of data processing performed includes data processing involved in any decompression of said computer file required for said virus scanning operation. However, Cozza discloses that limitation (Cozza: figure 4d and column 6 lines 6-45). It is well known in the art to decompress a file to its original content before using it. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Cozza within the system of Nachenberg because it allows the virus detection system to scan the original data after decompression.

17. Claims 10, 20, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nachenberg.

18. As per claim 10, 20, and 30, Nachenberg discloses a method a method as claimed according to claim 2, 12, and 22 respectively. Nachenberg further discloses said virus scanning operation applies a plurality of tests to said computer file, each test having an complexity value indicative of an amount of data processing associated with that test, and said step of determining terminating said virus scanning operation prior to completion if said complexity exceeds a termination complexity threshold value (Nachenberg: column 1 line 63 – column 2 line 50;

Art Unit: 2131

column 6 lines 32-40). Nachenberg does not explicitly disclose said measurement value being a sum of complexity values for tests applied during said virus scanning operation and determining terminating said virus scanning operation prior to completion if said sum of complexity values exceeds threshold. However, Nachenberg discloses the complexity of heuristics will affect the efficiency of the system and should be treated carefully. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use the complexity of the heuristics as threshold to increase the efficiency of the system.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nachenberg U.S. Pat. No. 5999723 discloses state-based cache for antivirus software.

Nachenberg U.S. Pat. No. 6357008 discloses dynamic heuristic method for detecting computer viruses using decryption exploration and evaluation phases.

Chen et al. U.S. Pat. No. 5832208 discloses anti-virus agent for use with database and mail servers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8654. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

Art Unit: 2131

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shin-Hon Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

SC

Emmanuel L. F. [Signature]
EMMANUEL L. F. [Stamp]
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art 2131